

## WA-Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes April 18, 2007

Attendees:

Member	Association	Representing
Michelle Blake	WSDOT GIS Data Steward	WA-Trans Project
Chuck Buzzard	Pierce County GIS	Local Govt. GIS
David Cullom	WA. Utilities & Transportation Commission	Rail And Utility Needs
Michael Fallon	Bureau of Land Management	Bureau of Land Management
Michaellyn Garcia	Census Bureau	US Bureau of Census
Holly Glaser	WSDOT Geographic Services	WA-Trans (GIS Analyst)
Tami Griffin	WSDOT Geographic Services	WA-Trans (Project Manager), Facilitator
Michael Leierer	WSDOT Geographic Services	WA-Trans (Assistant Project Manager/ Technical Lead)
Andy Norton	Puget Sound Regional Council	MPO and RTPO
Kathy O'Shea	Country Road Administration Board	County Road Administration Board
Ian Von Essen	Spokane County GIS	E-911
Pat Whittaker	WSDOT Transportation Data Office	WSDOT Transportation Data Office
Tim Young	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

Not Attending:

Member	Association	Representing
Tareq Al-Zeer	WSDOT NW Region Maintenance Engineer	WSDOT
Sam Bardelson	U.S. Geological Survey	U.S.G.S.
Kristina Evanoff	Sound Transit	Transit Needs
David Koch	WA Department of Information Service	Information Services Board – Project Oversight
Mac McKay	WA Department of Natural Resources	WADNR and Natural Resource Business Needs
Dave Rideout	Spokane County Engineers Office	East side local government
Lurleen Smith	Mason County Public Works	West side local government
Elizabeth Stratton	WSDOT	Freight Interests
Cathy Udenberg	Walla Walla County Public Works	Local Govt. GIS

- Introductions, Status Questions, Time Tracking, Action Item Review
- Pend Orielle County Update
- Return on Investment Report for FGDC
- Data User Portal Prototype & Requirements
- Data Provider Portal Requirements
- Pre-made Maps in Data User Portal?
- Metadata Minimum Requirements
- Action Item Review and Close

## **WA-Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes**

### **April 18, 2007**

## **Introductions, Status Questions, Time Tracking, Action Item Review**

Review of Action Items:

Chuck reported that it doesn't appear that the costs associated with the flooding in Pierce County directly fall under the WA-Trans umbrella. He was going to speak with Linda and see if there were more things that we could add, but right now it doesn't look like there are. He will report back.

Ian reported that he has the raw data regarding the ROI with but needs to spend direct time with Tami going through the numbers. It isn't black and white. Some years because the information was corrected the county actually lost money.

Ian also reported that Washington is trying to join a consortium to recover taxes via the Internet. There might be opportunity there.

## **Pend Orielle County Update**

Ian reported that they are doing a fair amount of coordinate geometry training in ArcGIS. When the county creates new plats they get the street line work and addresses. Once they have done that the county can update/create a road file. The 911 dept. did not want to switch software because the person doing the work is about 1 year from retirement. The rest of the county departments are moving to ESRI ArcGIS. Pend Orielle County has developed a preliminary road file that is an abridged version of WA-Trans. The county recently purchased an election systems and the first file they needed was a road file. That really helps moves systems along.

## **Return on Investment Report for FGDC**

Tami shared that the document presented to FGDC was written by GITA. Tami participated in the interviews and the note taking and calculating but was not given the document until early March just before it went to FGDC. There was no opportunity to vet the language and there are some things that need correction. Overall thought, it is a very good result.

Michaellyn identified a lot of "never" statements in the summary for the Census Bureau. A lot of the programs have not been funded yet, but will be funded. "Never" is incorrect. A lot of these have been funded.

Pat Whittaker asked that HPMS spelled out should be changed from "Management" to "Monitoring" System.

Ian – Asked that references to CRAB and Mobility be removed without a direct quote from Dave Rideout.

## **WA-Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes**

### **April 18, 2007**

Tami is going to continue to work on the ROI both in WSDOT and outside WSDOT. The big opportunity is other state agencies. Several that are very interested in the project have not been included.

#### ***Action Items:***

Michaellyn will send Tami corrections to the Census portion of the report.

Tami will make the changes Michaellyn, Pat and Ian identified and pass them on to FGDC and GITA.

Others let Tami know if there are any additional changes needed.

## **Data User Portal Prototype & Requirements**

These were designed for a user of WA-Trans data to come in through the Internet and get WA-Trans data. The requirements were provided by the steering committee as business requirements and then by a team on the One-Road pilot from Washington and Oregon. What was demonstrated was a prototype – not functional although it may appear to be functional.

Michael explained the menu bar across. It is mostly not functional yet in the prototype.

When there is a new user we need to know who the user is. We need to send the results of data requests and have the ability to store previous requests. This includes contact information, organization address; they may have an additional address. Submit the form. E-mail the user a log-in ID and password as a result of this.

Michael wanted feedback on how much information should be stored about a new user?

Ian felt a lot of folks don't like providing information. Spokane County requires a lot of warranty so we need them to sign in.

Chuck said if they ask for a whole bunch of information that you can't get anyway but in order to send the data to them by mail they have to give valid information.

Tim's feedback was in terms of changes there is too many addresses. Make the contact address mandatory and leave the organization address out of it as not being mandatory.

Ian's feedback was to change veteran user to "existing" or "previous" user to remove allusion to the armed forces.

Tami asked that Michael remove "interested in providing data" and just use contact.

Ian commented that what we are interested in having the best steward.

Chuck identified that on home page until you log in you can't get data. A lot of people don't have big screens. Chuck proposes putting login on top of state and then once they get logged in they don't see specific data until they have logged in.

## **WA-Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes April 18, 2007**

Tim commented that on the Data user account form we need to put a link about confidentiality policy since we are collecting information. (We may need to work with the AG).

Security questions can come up. These would be legitimate concerns about access to information about users and harvesting. But any data related to WA-Trans will not be directly accessible to anyone but system administrators.

How will metadata be formatted? We don't know how it will look? Will it include XML tags? Michael stated that very likely it will be formatted.

Feedback about downloading the data:

Chuck felt that the licensing agreement link needs to be shown in a scrolling text box in the page. It should resemble how it is done in software licensing on the Internet. We could make it large enough so people can read it.

Tim had question about download? Are you only able to do county centric download? Michael demonstrated that you can select extent, etc. Does the map viewer allow the user to add datasets? There is software that allows adding data to look at that we may be able to use for reference.

Tim is thinking of geodata.gov. You can add data from other URLs provided through other mapping services. Functionality might be pretty straight forward to implement if they can add data from other sources that aren't on the WSDOT site. For example a WIRA boundary.

Michael will send links out. Tami explained how important timely feedback was.

Login location feedback:

Chuck said there were a lot of options (tags that put something over the top) come in from the side. He doesn't like the scroll down to get to the login. If you put the login in a prominent position it keeps nuisances out of website if they require you to login. We don't want just anyone getting it.

Michaellyn thinks it should be more prominent. She doesn't feel it should be over the map because she feels the benefit to determining status.

Dave thinks it could be floating or something.

Michael agreed the login needs to be more prominent. Also want the map functionality but want to make sure users understand that they can't just click on the map and download data.

## **Data Provider Portal Prototype & Requirements**

## WA-Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes

### April 18, 2007

Tami asked that Michael remove references to private data until we are legally ready to have it.

Tim identified the question regarding accuracy of data. He felt we need to ask about source scale rather than accuracy. It is more reliable or if you want accuracy it is expressed as +/- 40 feet. Scale implies fitness for particular use.

Chuck suggested that maybe add alleys and driveways as a theme. Minimum attribute requirements for alleys and driveways are different than for a road. Minimum requirements will be different for different data themes and agreement points. *This is an important point that we will need different minimum requirements for different modes of transportation and types of data (such as agreement points).*

Mike Fallon has concern about trails. He may be a good source for trails.

Tami regarding minimum requirements: We need to remember that the person providing data has already worked with us, we have built them a translator and they already know what the minimum requirements.

Requirement must have metadata.

Attribute Mapping - the assumption is that the screen is pre-populated from previous uploads and then you change it. It is never entered from scratch because of the complexity of building a translator.

Tim felt you need more information about what's on this form. Pretend Tim uses kilometer. Tim questions whether you can use this as a maintenance process. We really need only attribute mapping, projection, etc. Unless there is a wholesale schema change then it gets more complex and more manual.

Chuck asked if the intent is to only get what is changed or the whole thing. We don't know that. The Puget Sound Pilot is going to have to deal with that. Do we just get the road file or updates? It is easier for Pierce County to just give us changes, but that puts the effort on the Pierce County side. Pierce County provides updates to the fire dept. What they wanted is a unique ID and then they check the Unique ID, etc. If a road splits to do you reuse IDs? Pierce County wrote something that generated an ID using route/milepost. If you split a road for new subdivision then it doesn't match. It is an easy way to handle it. We need to review this for options. Tami shared that she knows maintenance for data already in WA-Trans has to be worked out.

Dave said Metadata is a separate file from GIS submission. It will parse metadata file. Couldn't you pull fields from data instead of metadata? This actually was part of our intention.

Holly – if our units of measure are feet but we have been measuring things in milepost that kind of thing is done during the creation of the translator.

Minimum Data Requirements for Road:

## **WA-Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes**

### **April 18, 2007**

Segment Local Identifier - ESRI – generates one. All providers have one whether they use it for that or not. Is it perpetual? If you use a coverage it reassigns the same number over and over. If you use a geodatabase it is handled as an object id as you drop features out of there it drops the id and never reuses it. It doesn't need to be there. It is handy to link county information together. When the segments from one file in a county are different it helps link segments.

Segment Length – map length or route length? Not required but desired.

3 dates based on actual infrastructure (these are not required).

Local LRS Identifier is required. If they provide address geocoding and linear referencing data sets as separate files we may need another.

Begin and End Mile point is required.

Path description is not required

Local Length is not required

Local Length Measurement Method is required if you have a local length

FIPS County identifier is not required

Jurisdiction identifiers are supplied with local ones and they need to be cross walked with FIPs. They are required.

Full Street Name is required. Michael must change the definition.

Alternate name flag is not required

The rest is not required, but if the provider is submitting address data every one of these is required because you can't geocode without it. Site address is a different format but if you are doing linear geocoding it requires it.

Address related stuff as stated above.

Chuck pointed out that the primary business rule was to provide a geographic representation of a road to be able to do linear referencing and address geocoding. The attributes here meet those requirements.

The ones that we have are not required and they won't make us not meet the core business needs. We may not always actually get it but eventually we will provide all of them whether we provide it (WA-Trans), we find another system to do it or we help the locals to provide it, but there has to be a system in place to meet those three primary business requirements.

Example: For forest service they provide name and then we use length and directionality of arc for pseudo address to generate a linear referencing system.

## **WA-Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes**

### **April 18, 2007**

Chuck expressed concerns about Pierce County data in the The National Map and maintenance of that data.

#### ***Action Items:***

- Michael is open for suggestion about comments and messages. Send him your feedback!
- Michael will make changes to requirements and portals as desired and send out updates.

### **Metadata Minimum Requirements**

We did not send out material on this and so it will be put on the next meeting.

### **Next meeting and Action Item Review**

The next meeting is scheduled on July 19 in Olympia with video-conferencing in Seattle and Spokane.